

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

**Children at Risk:
The Effects of the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995
on the National Nutrition Safety Net**

October 23, 1995

Food and Consumer Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

J:HR4CONF.023

Executive Summary
Children at Risk: The Effects of the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995
on the National Nutrition Safety Net

The nutrition safety net protects the nutritional well-being of millions of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 14 million children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 82 percent of all benefits. An average of 1.8 million infants -- 45 percent of all infants born in the Nation -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, nearly 26 million children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 2.5 million children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$38 billion over seven years from nutrition benefits for children, a 20 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$24 billion, a 10 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 14 million children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$28 billion over seven years, a 16 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$20 billion, a 12 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$10 billion over seven years, a 10 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$4 billion, a 4 percent reduction. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen more than \$12 billion short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 50 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 8.3 million fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

Children at Risk: The Effects of the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 on the National Nutrition Safety Net

The Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 -- enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives in different versions -- threatens the foundation of the Nation's endeavor to get food to people who need it and jeopardizes the nutrition and health of millions of low-income American children and working families. Depending on the decisions made during conference, the final bill could unravel the national nutrition framework by creating block grants that cannot respond to changing economic conditions, eliminating national nutrition standards, and cutting essential nutrition benefits. These cuts will fall heavily on America's children.

The national nutrition safety net protects millions of children every day. The Food Stamp Program reaches nearly 14 million children -- more than half of all participants -- each month. Over 80 percent of all food stamps -- \$19 billion in 1995 -- benefit families with children. Every school day, nearly 26 million children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 2.5 million children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program. And WIC reaches over 5 million infants and children: forty-five percent of all infants born in the United States participate in the WIC Program.

Throughout their history, the Food Stamp, Child Nutrition and WIC Programs have produced significant and measurable positive nutrition outcomes among the children and families they serve. The programs work because of national eligibility, benefit, and nutrition standards; a funding structure that ensures the programs respond to changing needs caused by economic growth and recession; and Federal oversight, which helps ensure their integrity. The proposed changes could eliminate these protections, leaving children and working families vulnerable to shifts in the economy and changing State priorities.

The bills now pending before the Conference committee will make deep cuts in nutrition benefits. The House would cut nutrition assistance by \$50 billion over seven years; the Senate would cut over \$30 billion. Most of these cuts would fall heavily on children and their families: about three-quarters of the cuts in the House and Senate bills -- or \$38 billion and \$24 billion, respectively -- would affect America's children. By 2002, the House proposals would reduce nutrition benefits to families with children by 20 percent.

Child Nutrition Programs

While the Senate version of H.R. 4 largely retains the current structure of the Child Nutrition and WIC programs, the proposed reductions in reimbursement to schools, child care centers, and summer food service sites will strain the resources of these institutions to provide nutritious meals to a vulnerable population -- children. In contrast, the House proposes to eliminate the existing child nutrition programs and WIC, replacing them with two broadly defined block grants.

School-Based Nutrition Block Grant

- o **Overall funding for the school-based programs would be \$104 million less than the current policy in FY 1996, and \$2.4 billion less for the seven-year period 1996-2002.** An additional \$1.3 billion could be transferred out of the block grant in FY 1996 for non-food programs, which would compromise the health of children. If States transferred the maximum amount of money out of the block grant, food assistance for schoolchildren could be as much as 24 percent less than the projected 1996 level.
- o **The School-Based Nutrition Block Grant will eliminate the standards that guarantee America's children have access to healthy meals at school.** National nutrition standards developed over 50 years of program operations work. School meals meet the vitamin, mineral and calorie goals set for the program, and the USDA School Meals Initiative for Healthy Children has updated and improved the standards based on the most recent scientific research.

In a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and, faced with reduced funding, there would be no incentive to set standards that improve children's health. In fact, there are incentives to provide skimpier meals to all children regardless of income.

- o **The School-Based Nutrition Block Grant will not respond to economic recessions or recoveries.** In a recession States would be unable to respond without cutting back on the quality or quantity of food, raising taxes, or cutting other services so that children can eat. If enacted in 1989, this bill would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less in funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994. Between 1990 and 1994 the number of free lunches served to low-income children increased by 23 percent. During this same period, the number of free meals served in child care centers increased by 45 percent. USDA's nutrition programs expanded to meet those needs.

The block grant will not respond to changes in the school-age population, which is expected to increase by 4 to 6 percent in the time period of the grant. The grant amount would not provide additional money to help provide meals for additional children.

Since each year's funding would be based partially on the number of meals served in the previous year, States that serve a high proportion of free meals would be penalized. States that serve more total meals fare better in the allocation formula. Since it costs more to serve a free meal, States have an incentive to serve meals to more affluent students. Without national nutrition standards, States might also be inclined to cut the quality or amount of food provided in order to serve more meals in order to maximize funding.

Block grants would not simplify program administration with their requirements for income determination and meal counting, but they would have little ability to enforce accountability or program outcomes. In addition, block grants lack accountability. The reporting required is not a guarantee that poor children will be adequately served, or that the nutrition standards set will be appropriate to children's health needs. It also provides no guarantees that State oversight for program compliance will occur, which could allow errors or fraud to occur without detection.

Family Nutrition Block Grant

- o **For the Family Nutrition block grant, spending would be \$987 million less in FY 1996, and \$7.8 billion less over the seven-year period 1996-2002. Over \$900 million could be transferred out of the block grant in FY 1996 (equal to the maximum amount available for child care, summer and milk programs).**
- o **The Family Nutrition Block Grant risks the effectiveness of the WIC program.** By dropping national program requirements for the WIC program, there will be an erosion of national program standards that would reduce or reverse the proven effectiveness of WIC in such areas as reduced low-birthweight and infant mortality and increased prenatal and pediatric health care. Cost savings to the Medicaid Program, now valued at \$400 million to \$1.3 billion, would decline. WIC program cost containment efforts would be diminished and the cost of food provided would increase. Cost containment efforts for just infant formula amount to over \$1 billion and fund services for nearly 1.6 million persons each month. If reductions of even 5 percent -- \$50 million -- occur in rebate amounts, there would be 100,000 fewer women, infants and children served in a WIC-type program.

The positive Federal influence on cost containment was recently demonstrated. When a Western State rebid its infant formula rebate contract only after threat of sanction, the winning bidder provided an 8 percent increase in its rebate per can of formula. This will allow service to thousands of needy women, infants and children.

- o **The amount available will be 47 percent less than what is projected to be spent in FY 1996 on the Child and Adult Care Food Program, the Summer Food Service Programs, and the Special Milk Program.** Over 1 million children currently receiving the benefits of the meals in child care would no longer be eligible to participate in nutrition programs. The block grant would prohibit service to children from families with incomes over 185 percent of poverty--about \$28,000 for a family of four in FY 1996.

The Family Nutrition Block Grant would eliminate the viability of supporting meals served in 190,000 family day care homes. Denying children in family day care homes the modest subsidy for meals available to children in school-based programs will drive family day care homes out of the program, and deny children access to

healthy meals. If welfare reform efforts result in more working, low-income parents, this effect will be more pronounced.

- o **Eighty percent of the funds in the block grant are set aside for WIC-like services. The remaining 20 percent of funds are insufficient to serve even the current number of low income children on the child care, summer and special milk programs by \$73 million in FY 1996.**

If States continue to operate the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) at current levels, the funds remaining in the Family Nutrition Block Grant to provide meals to low-income children in child care would be \$256 million below the current service level. This would cause over 290,000 low-income children receiving child care meals to lose meal benefits.

If States opt to eliminate summer food service outside of schools, in order to maintain nutrition assistance in child care programs, nearly 1.5 million low-income children would lose summer meal benefits. In addition, funds available to serve low-income children in child care would still be more than \$50 million less than the amount needed to continue serving meals to low-income children. This would cause over 50,000 low-income children in child care to lose meal benefits. A total of 1.6 million low income children would lose benefits.

States which serve large numbers of low-income children through CACFP--such as New York, Illinois and Florida--receive the largest reductions.

Senate Provisions

- o **Welfare reform legislation passed by the Senate would save \$141 million in FY 1996 in the child nutrition programs and \$ 4.4 billion over seven years.** The proposed legislation would reduce per meal reimbursement rates, delay indexation of rates and eliminate additional 2-cent payments for meals served in schools with a high proportion of low-income participants. In excess of \$100 million of program cuts are attributed to reduced participation among upper-income students (above 185 percent of poverty) who would face higher prices due to reductions in Federal subsidies. USDA estimates that by 1998 lunch participation would decline by 450,000 students daily, or slightly less than 2 percent of projected participation.
- o **The proposal would also institute a means test in family day care homes (FDCHs), create a second, lower, reimbursement rate for meals served to children from households with incomes above 185 percent of poverty, and round down rates.** It would cut a projected \$3.2 billion over seven years. While USDA estimates that the new reimbursement structure would not measurably affect participation among current FDCHs, it would slow the rate of program growth. As a result, participation would be about 4 percent lower than current projections in FY 1997, a decrease of 50,000 children daily.

- o **The Senate bill would reduce reimbursement rates for meals served in the SFSP** and round down rates, cutting nearly \$150 million over 5 years. The rate reductions would also slow program expansion. In 1996, 120,000 fewer children would be served daily, a decrease of 5 percent.
- o **The Senate reconciliation bill would save an additional \$536 million over the Senate welfare reform proposal** by further reducing reimbursement rates in the SFSP and by decreasing per meal commodity reimbursement.

Food Stamp Program

The Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 -- by dramatically altering the Food Stamp Program -- would undermine the national nutrition safety net that has successfully narrowed the gap between the diets of low-income and other families. By changing eligibility rules and benefit levels, the proposed bill would cut food stamp benefits deeply. As many as 1 million recipients would lose all benefits; virtually all others, including nearly 14 million children, would receive less.

- o **Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals.** The House would cut more than \$40 billion from the Food Stamp Program over the next seven years; the Senate would cut \$27 billion. Over 70 percent of these cuts -- or \$28 billion in the House and \$20 billion in the Senate -- would affect families with children. *By the year 2002, the House would reduce benefits to families with children by 25 percent;* the Senate would reduce these benefits by 13 percent. Reductions of this magnitude could have profound consequences for the nutrition, the health, and the well-being of millions of children, working families, and elderly.

The private sector would not be able to step into the gap in the national nutrition safety net, especially in times of economic recession. The size of the anticipated food stamp reductions are far larger than private charities could absorb. For example, in 1992, Second Harvest, the largest charitable hunger relief organization in the United States, distributed 769 million pounds of food with an estimated value of about \$360 million.¹ The reduction in food stamps in the first year alone under H.R. 4 is six to seven times larger than the value of food distributed by Second Harvest, the largest current effort in the private sector.

- o **The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of children and poor families.** Replacing the Food Stamp Program with a block grant could have serious consequences for the health and well-

¹ The amount of food distributed is reported in Second Harvest's 1993 National Research Study. In 1994, USDA distributed 276 million pounds of food through the Emergency Food Assistance Program with an estimated value of \$129 million, an average of 46.6 cents per pound. If the food distributed by Second Harvest has a comparable value, 769 million pounds is worth approximately \$358 million.

being of the Nation's families and children. A food stamp block grant would weaken the national nutrition safety net, eliminate the Program's ability to respond to changing economic conditions, eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards, and sever the link between food stamps and nutrition.

Historically, the Food Stamp Program has automatically expanded to meet increased need when the economy is in recession and contracted when the economy is growing, making sure that food gets to people who need it. Food stamp benefits automatically flow to communities, States or regions that face rising unemployment or poverty. The effect is to cushion some of the harsher effects of economic recession and provide a stimulus to weakening economies.

It is not possible for a food stamp block grant to respond to economic or demographic changes in this way. While the number of people eligible for and in need of assistance will grow as the economy weakens, unemployment rises, or poverty increases, Federal funding would no longer automatically increase in response to the rising need. States would have to decide whether to cut benefits, tighten eligibility, or dedicate their own revenues to the Food Stamp Program. The demand for assistance to help children and working families would be greatest at precisely the time when State economies are weakest.

The importance of the loss of an automatic adjustment in the Food Stamp Program can be illustrated best by looking back to the period between 1989 and 1994 when the U.S. economy fell into recession and subsequently recovered. What would have happened if all States had elected to take a block grant similar to that offered by the House and Senate bills? *By 1994, block grant funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen more than \$12 billion short of actual need, a reduction of 50 percent.*

Funding reductions of this size could have required dramatic reductions in the number of people served by the Food Stamp Program. *For the Nation as a whole, the Food Stamp Program would have been able to serve 8.3 million fewer children.*

- o **The House's cap on food stamp appropriations will disrupt essential program functions.** This provision has the potential to cause serious hardship for millions of children and working families who need nutrition assistance and challenge the capacity of program administrators to manage the program effectively. Any weakening in the economy over the next few years could trigger benefit reductions above and beyond the deep cuts taken elsewhere in the bill.

If the same cap proposed by the House this year had been enacted in the 1990 Farm Bill, food stamp benefits in the last six months of 1995 would have been reduced by more than half, absent other Congressional action. The average monthly benefit per person would have fallen from about \$71 to \$34. Alternatively, the Food Stamp Program could have shut down completely for more than three months, issuing no benefit to any household: nearly 14 million children would have gone without essential food stamp benefits. Both options effectively eliminate the ability of low-income families to purchase an adequate, nutritious diet.

America needs a national system of Federal nutrition programs that establishes and meets nutrition standards, responds to economic changes, and ensures that the health and nutritional well-being of families and children are protected. The size of the reductions proposed in both bills and the hole created in the nutritional safety net with block grants have serious consequences for the nutrition, health, and well-being of millions of American children.

SUMMARY TABLES

**Table 1 -- Effects of the Personal Responsibility Act
on Nutrition Benefits for Children**
(Dollars in Millions)

	House Proposals		Senate Proposals	
	Seven-Year Total	Percent	Seven-Year Total	Percent
All Households				
Food Stamp Program	- \$40,350	- 19.4	- \$27,005 ¹	- 13.0
Special Nutrition Programs	- 10,155	- 10.2	- 4,444	- 4.5
Total	- 50,505	- 16.5	- 31,449	- 10.2
Children				
Food Stamp Program	- 28,096	- 16.4	- 19,651	- 11.5
Special Nutrition Programs	- 10,155	- 10.2	- 4,444	- 4.5
Total	- 38,251	- 12.5	- 24,095	- 7.9

¹ Excludes increased costs for the Nutrition Assistance Program in Puerto Rico, totaling \$845 million over seven years. The total estimated reductions under the Senate's version of H.R. 4 including these costs is \$26,160 million.

Estimates exclude increases in food stamp benefits resulting from cuts in cash welfare payments made elsewhere in the bills.

These are preliminary FCS estimates based on H.R. 4 as passed by the House of Representatives on March 24, 1995 and by the Senate on September 19, 1995, and they are subject to change. They have not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

Table 2 -- Summary of the Effects of the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 on Child Nutrition and WIC Program Costs
(Dollars in millions)

	1996 ¹	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	5-Year Total	7-Year Total
Projected Costs under Current Law²									
Total Program Costs	12,378	12,293	13,509	14,095	14,725	15,410	16,086	67,630	99,126
Reductions Proposed by the House									
Total Program Costs	-1,010	-1,190	-1,336	-1,437	-1,568	-1,698	-1,831	-6,622	-10,155
Percent Reduction	-8.8	-9.2	-9.9	-10.2	-10.7	-11.0	-11.4	-9.8	-10.2
Reductions Proposed by the Senate									
Total Program Costs	-141	-580	-616	-672	-756	-826	-906	-2,715	-4,444
Percent Reduction	-1.1	-4.3	-4.6	-4.8	-5.3	-5.4	-5.6	-4.0	-4.5

¹ Assumes full-year implementation, retroactive to October 1, 1995.

² In excess of 99 percent of all Child Nutrition and WIC Program dollars are provided to households with children.

These are preliminary FCS estimates based on H.R.4 as passed by the House of Representatives on March 24, 1995 and the Senate on September 19, 1995 and are subject to change. They have not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget. Sums may not equal totals due to rounding.

**Table 3 -- Effects of the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995
on the Child Nutrition and WIC Programs as Passed by the House**
(Dollars in millions)

State	Seven Year Total (1996 - 2002)			Full Implementation (2002)			
	Total Costs Among Families with Children Under Current Law	Loss Among Families with Children	Percent Loss	Total Costs Among Families with Children Under Current Law	Loss Among Families with Children	Percent Loss	Number of Children Affected ¹ (000s)
Alabama	\$1,963	- \$192	- 9.8	\$319	- \$37	- 11.5	676
Alaska	305	- 71	- 23.2	49	- 17	- 34.7	65
Arizona	1,656	- 216	- 13.0	272	- 44	- 16.2	495
Arkansas	1,221	- 113	- 9.3	199	- 20	- 10.1	396
California	12,529	- 1,831	- 14.6	2,022	- 390	- 19.3	3,110
Colorado	1,080	- 143	- 13.2	179	- 30	- 16.8	386
Connecticut	865	- 48	- 5.5	139	- 3	- 2.2	301
Delaware	277	- 33	- 11.8	47	- 6	- 12.1	87
Dist. of Columbia	277	- 36	- 13.0	45	- 8	- 19.0	66
Florida	5,107	- 599	- 11.7	824	- 109	- 13.3	1,467
Georgia	3,144	- 173	- 5.5	507	- 20	- 3.9	1,177
Hawaii	478	- 60	- 12.6	76	- 10	- 12.7	184
Idaho	425	- 19	- 4.5	68	- 1	- 0.8	173
Illinois	3,671	- 271	- 7.4	594	- 36	- 5.9	1,191
Indiana	1,635	- 77	- 4.7	262	+ 2	+ 0.7	740
Iowa	897	- 36	- 4.0	146	0	+ 0.1	454
Kansas	1,127	- 168	- 14.9	190	- 37	- 19.3	409
Kentucky	1,673	- 115	- 6.9	270	- 17	- 6.2	628
Louisiana	2,731	- 365	- 13.4	450	- 85	- 18.9	816
Maine	424	- 61	- 14.4	70	- 12	- 17.7	140
Maryland	1,410	- 182	- 12.9	231	- 33	- 14.4	456
Massachusetts	1,640	- 164	- 10.0	270	- 29	- 10.7	582
Michigan	2,613	- 220	- 8.4	423	- 30	- 7.2	970
Minnesota	1,794	- 241	- 13.4	305	- 43	- 14.0	689
Mississippi	1,811	- 208	- 11.5	295	- 45	- 15.3	523
Missouri	1,847	- 163	- 8.8	300	- 25	- 8.4	684
Montana	340	- 49	- 14.4	56	- 10	- 18.2	115
Nebraska	734	- 111	- 15.1	123	- 24	- 19.4	269
Nevada	361	- 39	- 10.8	57	- 5	- 9.5	118
New Hampshire	296	- 12	- 4.0	47	- 1	- 1.3	109
New Jersey	1,855	- 91	- 4.9	299	- 4	- 1.4	654
New Mexico	1,061	- 199	- 18.8	179	- 47	- 26.3	267
New York	6,956	- 552	- 7.9	131	- 91	- 8.1	2,116
North Carolina	2,680	- 251	- 9.4	436	- 41	- 9.4	935
North Dakota	325	- 53	- 16.3	55	- 12	- 21.3	123

State	Seven Year Total (1996 - 2002)			Full Implementation (2002)			
	Total Costs Among Families with Children Under Current Law	Loss Among Families with Children	Percent Loss	Total Costs Among Families with Children Under Current Law	Loss Among Families with Children	Percent Loss	Number of Children Affected ¹ (000s)
Ohio	3,145	- 231	- 7.3	507	- 29	- 5.7	1,245
Oklahoma	1,408	- 165	- 11.7	231	- 31	- 13.4	474
Oregon	1,033	- 138	- 13.4	170	- 26	- 15.1	333
Pennsylvania	3,170	- 133	- 4.2	510	- 2	- 0.5	1,264
Rhode Island	263	- 21	- 8.0	42	- 3	- 7.0	81
South Carolina	1,754	- 139	- 7.9	284	- 21	- 7.4	560
South Dakota	342	- 29	- 8.5	56	- 5	- 8.1	136
Tennessee	1,973	- 165	- 8.4	319	- 24	- 7.7	724
Texas	9,022	- 1,115	- 12.4	1,461	- 2	- 15.3	2,743
Utah	926	- 132	- 14.2	154	- 27	- 17.8	327
Vermont	201	- 19	- 9.5	33	- 3	- 8.2	70
Virginia	1,765	- 87	- 4.9	285	- 2	- 0.8	124
Washington	1,682	- 232	- 13.8	276	- 48	- 17.4	536
West Virginia	755	- 75	- 9.9	122	- 14	- 11.4	246
Wisconsin	1,368	+ 2	+ 0.1	221	+ 19	+ 8.5	618
Wyoming	196	- 25	- 12.8	32	- 5	- 16.3	74
Total	99,126	- 10,155	- 10.2	16,086	- 1,831	- 11.4	32,407

¹ Total children participating in the National School Lunch Program, Child and Adult Care Food Program or WIC. Under a block grant, these children may experience a change in eligibility status, meal price increases, decreases in meal quality or changes in food package composition and amounts.

Totals include Puerto Rico, territories, outlying areas, Indian Tribal Organizations, and Department of Defense schools.

These are preliminary FCS estimates based on H.R. 4 as passed by the House of Representatives on March 24, 1995 and are subject to change. They have not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

Table 4 -- Summary of the Effects of the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 on Food Stamp Program Costs
(Dollars in millions)

	1996 ¹	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	5-Year Total	7-Year Total
Projected Costs under Current Law²									
Total Program Costs	26,120	27,347	28,521	29,677	30,846	32,145	33,478	142,511	208,134
Among Households with Children	21,444	22,452	23,415	24,365	25,324	26,391	27,485	117,001	170,878
Reductions Proposed by the House									
Total Program Costs	-2,215	-4,400	-5,190	-5,775	-6,370	-7,525	-8,875	-23,950	-40,350
Percent Reduction	-8.5	-16.1	-18.2	-19.5	-20.7	-23.4	-26.5	-16.8	-19.4
Among Households with Children	-653	-2,788	-3,632	-4,111	-4,600	-5,581	-6,731	-15,784	-28,096
Percent Reduction	-3.0	-12.4	-15.5	-16.9	-18.2	-21.2	-24.5	-13.5	-16.4
Reductions Proposed by the Senate³									
Total Program Costs	-2,655	-3,685	-3,610	-3,880	-4,140	-4,380	-4,655	-17,970	-27,005
Percent Reduction	-10.2	-13.5	-12.7	-13.1	-13.4	-13.6	-13.9	-12.6	-13.0
Among Households with Children	-1,789	-2,389	-2,673	-2,890	-3,104	-3,303	-3,503	-12,845	-19,651
Percent Reduction	-8.3	-10.6	-11.4	-11.9	-12.3	-12.5	-12.8	-11.0	-11.5

¹ Assumes full-year implementation, retroactive to October 1, 1995.

² Excludes the Nutrition Assistance Program in Puerto Rico, which is projected at \$1,143 million each year.

³ Excludes the increased costs of reauthorizing the Nutrition Assistance Program in Puerto Rico, which would decrease savings by \$410 million over five years and \$845 million over seven years.

Estimates exclude increases in food stamp benefits resulting from cuts in cash welfare payments made elsewhere in the bills.

These are preliminary FCS estimates based on H.R.4 as passed by the House of Representatives on March 24, 1995 and the Senate on September 19, 1995 and are subject to change. They have not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget. Sums may not equal totals due to rounding.

**Table 5 -- Effects of the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995
on the Food Stamp Program as Passed by the House**
(Dollars in millions)

State	Seven Year Total (1996 - 2002)			Full Implementation (2002)			
	Total Costs Among Families with Children Under Current Law	Loss Among Families with Children	Percent Loss	Total Costs Among Families with Children Under Current Law	Loss Among Families with Children	Percent Loss	Number of Children Losing Benefits (000s)
Alabama	\$3,555	- \$463	- 13.0	\$572	- \$120	- 20.9	286
Alaska	397	- 47	- 11.8	64	- 12	- 18.9	24
Arizona	3,073	- 488	- 15.9	494	- 119	- 24.1	266
Arkansas	1,652	- 217	- 13.1	266	- 56	- 21.1	140
California	18,399	- 3,652	- 19.9	2,960	- 831	- 28.1	1,915
Colorado	1,779	- 269	- 15.1	286	- 66	- 23.2	147
Connecticut	1,157	- 203	- 17.5	186	- 48	- 26.0	116
Delaware	374	- 53	- 14.2	60	- 13	- 22.2	31
Dist. of Columbia	609	- 84	- 13.9	98	- 21	- 21.9	48
Florida	9,839	- 1,686	- 17.1	1,583	- 401	- 25.3	782
Georgia	5,187	- 676	- 13.0	834	- 175	- 20.9	413
Hawaii	904	- 127	- 14.1	145	- 32	- 21.8	50
Idaho	464	- 73	- 15.7	75	- 18	- 23.8	42
Illinois	7,890	- 1,285	- 16.3	1,269	- 310	- 24.5	607
Indiana	3,266	- 452	- 13.8	525	- 115	- 21.9	255
Iowa	1,131	- 165	- 14.6	182	- 42	- 22.8	96
Kansas	1,090	- 197	- 18.1	175	- 45	- 25.9	92
Kentucky	3,233	- 430	- 13.3	520	- 111	- 21.4	239
Louisiana	5,182	- 686	- 13.2	834	- 176	- 21.2	406
Maine	758	- 107	- 14.1	122	- 27	- 22.5	60
Maryland	2,589	- 445	- 17.2	417	- 104	- 24.9	196
Massachusetts	2,536	- 472	- 18.6	408	- 110	- 27.0	227
Michigan	6,192	- 900	- 14.5	996	- 227	- 22.8	509
Minnesota	1,846	- 301	- 16.3	297	- 72	- 24.4	171
Mississippi	3,234	- 434	- 13.4	520	- 112	- 21.5	271
Missouri	3,619	- 515	- 14.2	582	- 131	- 22.5	288
Montana	427	- 60	- 14.0	69	- 15	- 22.0	34
Nebraska	646	- 91	- 14.0	104	- 23	- 22.2	60
Nevada	657	- 98	- 15.0	106	- 24	- 23.0	55
New Hampshire	350	- 55	- 15.7	56	- 14	- 24.0	29
New Jersey	3,692	- 627	- 17.0	594	- 145	- 24.4	266
New Mexico	1,597	- 258	- 16.1	257	- 62	- 24.2	131
New York	12,221	- 2,854	- 23.4	1,966	- 614	- 31.2	957
North Carolina	3,815	- 503	- 13.2	614	- 130	- 21.2	321
North Dakota	286	- 39	- 13.7	46	- 10	- 21.5	24

State	Seven Year Total (1996 - 2002)			Full Implementation (2002)			
	Total Costs Among Families with Children Under Current Law	Loss Among Families with Children	Percent Loss	Total Costs Among Families with Children Under Current Law	Loss Among Families with Children	Percent Loss	Number of Children Losing Benefits (000s)
Ohio	8,080	- 1,211	- 15.0	1,300	- 301	- 23.2	606
Oklahoma	2,303	- 320	- 13.9	371	- 82	- 22.0	178
Oregon	1,740	- 388	- 22.3	280	- 83	- 29.8	136
Pennsylvania	6,873	- 984	- 14.3	1,106	- 251	- 22.7	551
Rhode Island	580	- 135	- 23.3	93	- 29	- 30.8	49
South Carolina	2,494	- 324	- 13.0	401	- 84	- 20.9	212
South Dakota	360	- 48	- 13.3	58	- 12	- 20.9	32
Tennessee	4,439	- 619	- 13.9	714	-160	- 22.4	361
Texas	17,739	- 3,107	- 17.5	2,853	- 735	- 25.7	1,410
Utah	812	- 122	- 15.0	131	- 30	- 23.0	73
Vermont	285	- 42	- 14.7	46	- 11	- 22.9	25
Virginia	3,375	- 492	- 14.6	543	- 123	- 22.6	259
Washington	2,878	- 635	- 22.1	463	- 137	- 29.7	228
West Virginia	2,241	- 292	- 13.0	360	- 76	- 21.0	206
Wisconsin	1,886	- 288	- 15.3	303	- 71	- 23.3	179
Wyoming	222	- 29	- 13.1	36	- 7	- 20.8	19
Total	170,878	- 28,096	- 16.4	27,485	- 6,731	- 24.5	14,074

Totals include territories, outlying areas and administrative costs not allocated to States and families.

Estimates exclude increases in food stamp benefits resulting from cuts in cash welfare payments made elsewhere in the bills.

These are preliminary FCS estimates based on H.R. 4 as passed by the House of Representatives on March 24, 1995 and are subject to change. They have not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

**Table 6 -- Effects of the Personal Responsibility Act of 1995
on the Food Stamp Program by State for Fiscal Years 1996 - 2002**
(Dollars in millions)

State	Projected Food Stamp Costs Under Current Law	Reductions Proposed by the Senate				Reductions Proposed by the House			
		Loss Among All Participants		Loss Among Families with Children		Loss Among All Participants		Loss Among Families with Children	
		Total	Percent	Total	Percent of Total Reduction	Total	Percent	Total	Percent of Total Reduction
Alabama	\$4,288	- \$449	- 10.5	- \$332	74.0	- \$652	- 15.2	- \$463	71.0
Alaska	462	- 48	- 10.5	- 36	74.9	- 67	- 14.6	- 47	69.6
Arizona	3,659	- 425	- 11.6	- 311	73.1	- 684	- 18.7	- 488	71.3
Arkansas	1,969	- 210	- 10.7	- 158	75.1	- 301	- 15.3	- 217	72.2
California	20,489	- 2,697	- 13.2	- 2,198	81.5	- 4,531	- 22.1	- 3,652	80.6
Colorado	2,108	- 264	- 12.5	- 195	73.8	- 384	- 18.2	- 269	70.0
Connecticut	1,388	- 230	- 16.6	- 167	72.6	- 306	- 22.1	- 203	66.1
Delaware	445	- 52	- 11.7	- 38	73.9	- 76	- 17.0	- 53	70.0
District of Columbia	779	- 91	- 11.7	- 59	65.1	- 138	- 17.8	- 84	61.0
Florida	12,299	- 1,477	- 12.0	- 1,067	72.3	- 2,378	- 19.3	- 1,686	70.9
Georgia	6,219	- 657	- 10.6	- 478	72.8	- 971	- 15.6	- 676	69.6
Hawaii	1,235	- 125	- 10.1	- 81	64.8	- 202	- 16.3	- 127	63.2
Idaho	536	- 67	- 12.5	- 52	77.7	- 97	- 18.2	- 73	74.7
Illinois	9,764	- 1,310	- 13.4	- 928	70.8	- 1,922	- 19.7	- 1,285	66.9
Indiana	3,797	- 443	- 11.7	- 336	75.9	- 629	- 16.6	- 452	71.8
Iowa	1,366	- 173	- 12.7	- 128	74.0	- 237	- 17.4	- 165	69.5
Kansas	1,312	- 203	- 15.5	- 154	75.8	- 274	- 20.9	- 197	71.8
Kentucky	3,952	- 444	- 11.2	- 313	70.5	- 645	- 16.3	- 430	66.6
Louisiana	6,061	- 624	- 10.3	- 478	76.5	- 928	- 15.3	- 686	73.9
Maine	1,040	- 139	- 13.4	- 88	63.3	- 186	- 27.8	- 107	57.7
Maryland	3,150	- 457	- 14.5	- 337	73.8	- 641	- 20.4	- 445	69.4
Massachusetts	3,062	- 449	- 14.7	- 339	75.4	- 653	- 21.3	- 472	72.4
Michigan	7,928	- 1,011	- 12.8	- 671	66.4	- 1,459	- 18.4	- 900	61.7
Minnesota	2,243	- 318	- 14.2	- 233	73.3	- 439	- 19.6	- 301	68.5
Mississippi	3,827	- 398	- 10.4	- 304	76.3	- 587	- 15.3	- 434	73.9
Missouri	4,424	- 538	- 12.2	- 374	69.5	- 788	- 17.8	- 515	65.3
Montana	520	- 61	- 11.8	- 45	74.2	- 85	- 16.3	- 60	70.3
Nebraska	759	- 88	- 11.7	- 70	79.4	- 119	- 15.7	- 91	76.3

State	Projected Food Stamp Costs Under Current Law	Reductions Proposed by the Senate				Reductions Proposed by the House			
		Loss Among All Participants		Loss Among Families with Children		Loss Among All Participants		Loss Among Families with Children	
		Total	Percent	Total	Percent of Total Reduction	Total	Percent	Total	Percent of Total Reduction
Nevada	808	- 98	- 12.2	- 66	66.9	- 154	- 19.0	- 98	63.9
New Hampshire	431	- 67	- 15.6	- 47	69.9	- 87	- 20.3	- 55	62.7
New Jersey	4,547	- 624	- 13.7	- 465	74.5	- 880	- 19.4	- 627	71.3
New Mexico	1,815	- 212	- 11.7	- 173	81.7	- 323	- 17.8	- 258	79.9
New York	16,974	- 3,114	- 18.4	- 2,084	66.9	- 4,474	- 26.4	- 2,854	63.8
North Carolina	4,515	- 494	- 10.9	- 373	75.6	- 697	- 15.5	- 503	72.1
North Dakota	344	- 44	- 12.9	- 34	77.5	- 54	- 15.6	- 39	73.1
Ohio	10,332	- 1,343	- 13.0	- 895	66.7	- 1,953	- 18.9	- 1,211	62.0
Oklahoma	2,759	- 309	- 11.2	- 226	73.1	- 458	- 16.6	- 320	69.7
Oregon	2,222	- 419	- 18.9	- 308	73.6	- 561	- 25.2	- 388	69.3
Pennsylvania	9,237	- 1,235	- 13.4	- 740	60.0	- 1,806	- 19.6	- 984	54.5
Rhode Island	691	- 136	- 19.7	- 106	77.9	- 183	- 26.5	- 135	73.7
South Carolina	2,850	- 292	- 10.3	- 234	80.1	- 418	- 14.7	- 324	77.5
South Dakota	411	- 47	- 11.5	- 38	81.4	- 61	- 14.9	- 48	78.0
Tennessee	5,612	- 667	- 11.9	- 435	65.2	- 1,009	- 18.0	- 619	61.3
Texas	20,870	- 2,568	- 12.3	- 1,959	76.3	- 4,151	- 19.9	- 3,107	74.9
Utah	943	- 114	- 12.0	- 86	75.9	- 168	- 17.8	- 122	72.7
Vermont	372	- 51	- 13.6	- 34	67.7	- 67	- 18.0	- 42	62.2
Virginia	4,182	- 507	- 12.1	- 352	69.4	- 750	- 17.9	- 492	65.7
Washington	3,544	- 640	- 18.1	- 475	74.3	- 905	- 25.5	- 635	70.2
West Virginia	2,357	- 248	- 10.5	- 221	89.4	- 335	- 14.2	- 292	87.0
Wisconsin	2,188	- 290	- 13.2	- 230	79.5	- 383	- 17.5	- 288	75.3
Wyoming	253	- 29	- 11.7	- 23	76.4	- 41	- 16.0	- 29	71.9
Total ¹	208,134 ²	- 27,005 ³	- 13.0	- 19,651	72.8	- 40,350	- 19.4	- 28,096	69.6

Notes to Table 6:

¹ Totals include territories and outlying areas. The total loss includes proposed changes that affect program administration not allocated to States and participants.

² Excludes the Nutrition Assistance Program in Puerto Rico, which is projected at \$1,143 million each year.

³ Excludes the increased cost of reauthorizing the Nutrition Assistance Program in Puerto Rico, which would decrease savings by \$845 million over seven years.

Estimates exclude increases in food stamp benefits resulting from cuts in cash welfare payments made elsewhere in the bills.

These are preliminary FCS estimates based on H.R. 4 as passed by the House of Representatives on March 24, 1995, by the Senate on September 19, 1995, and they are subject to change. They have not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

**Table 7 -- Historical Illustration of the Effects of a Food Stamp Block Grant
During an Economic Recession: Impacts on States in Fiscal Year 1994
(Dollars in millions)**

State	Level of Food Stamp Funding		Difference		Reduction in:	
	1994 Actual	Estimated Block Grant	Total	Percent	Participants (000s)	Children (000s)
Alabama	\$487	\$288	- \$199	- 41	- 307	- 140
Alaska	60	32	- 29	- 48	- 29	- 17
Arizona	437	166	- 271	- 62	- 364	- 199
Arkansas	226	137	- 89	- 39	- 162	- 68
California	2,641	806	-1,835	- 70	- 2,401	- 1,580
Colorado	236	134	- 103	- 44	- 150	- 74
Connecticut	169	59	- 109	- 65	- 163	- 85
Delaware	52	20	- 32	- 61	- 40	- 23
District of Columbia	94	40	- 54	- 58	- 59	- 32
Florida	1,405	439	- 966	- 69	- 1,126	- 568
Georgia	744	310	- 434	- 58	- 575	- 279
Guam	24	16	- 7	- 31	- 6	- 4
Hawaii	163	90	- 73	- 45	- 63	- 29
Idaho	62	42	- 20	- 33	- 42	- 20
Illinois	1,119	778	- 342	- 31	- 522	- 231
Indiana	441	218	- 223	- 51	- 344	- 168
Iowa	153	115	- 38	- 25	- 83	- 35
Kansas	153	82	- 71	- 47	- 114	- 53
Kentucky	443	331	- 111	- 25	- 229	- 86
Louisiana	682	486	- 196	- 29	- 328	- 142
Maine	116	56	- 60	- 52	- 89	- 36
Maryland	371	184	- 187	- 50	- 230	- 119
Massachusetts	356	167	- 189	- 53	- 259	- 120
Michigan	894	543	- 351	- 39	- 503	- 246
Minnesota	257	133	- 124	- 48	- 185	- 88
Mississippi	417	320	- 97	- 23	- 207	- 84
Missouri	509	255	- 254	- 50	- 375	- 169
Montana	62	40	- 22	- 36	- 36	- 15
Nebraska	85	55	- 30	- 35	- 58	- 27
Nevada	94	29	- 65	- 69	- 75	- 40
New Hampshire	48	12	- 36	- 75	- 53	- 26
New Jersey	539	261	- 278	- 52	- 324	- 157
New Mexico	208	106	- 102	- 49	- 153	- 76
New York	2,081	1,039	- 1,042	- 50	- 1,223	- 459
North Carolina	524	241	- 283	- 54	- 431	- 195
North Dakota	38	22	- 15	- 41	- 26	- 11
Ohio	1,152	769	- 383	- 33	- 603	- 259
Oklahoma	324	181	- 143	- 44	- 223	- 102
Oregon	259	154	- 106	- 41	- 162	- 71
Pennsylvania	1,083	596	- 487	- 45	- 686	- 319
Rhode Island	82	36	- 45	- 56	- 60	- 30
South Carolina	321	182	- 139	- 43	- 237	- 112

State	Level of Food Stamp Funding		Difference		Reduction in:	
	1994 Actual	Estimated Block Grant	Total	Percent	Participants (000s)	Children (000s)
South Dakota	45	34	- 11	- 25	- 21	- 9
Tennessee	627	315	- 312	- 50	- 473	- 201
Texas	2,463	1,059	- 1,404	- 57	- 1,845	- 936
Utah	103	61	- 42	- 41	- 72	- 37
Vermont	48	20	- 29	- 60	- 46	- 20
Virginia	489	217	- 272	- 56	- 375	- 174
Virgin Islands	25	20	- 6	- 22	- 9	- 6
Washington	421	195	- 226	- 54	- 284	- 127
West Virginia	268	170	- 97	- 36	- 149	- 75
Wisconsin	252	172	- 80	- 32	- 155	- 74
Wyoming	30	20	- 10	- 34	- 17	- 8
Total	24,490	12,258	-12,233	- 50	- 16,754	- 8,259

Total includes other Federal program costs and outlying territories not shown in the table. Individual cells may not sum to totals due to rounding.

Each State's block grant amount is equal to the higher of the State's 1988 food stamp funding or the average from 1986-1988.

The participation impacts assume that States cope with the loss of funds by lowering the food stamp income eligibility limits to eliminate participants with relatively high incomes.

STATE-BY-STATE ANALYSIS

ALABAMA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Alabama protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 288,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 83 percent of all benefits. An average of 36,000 infants -- 59 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 551,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 31,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$655 million over seven years from Alabama's nutrition benefits for children, an 18 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$405 million, an 8 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 288,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$463 million over seven years, a 13 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$332 million, a 9 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$192 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$73 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Alabama.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$199 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 41 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 140,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

ALASKA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Alaska protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 24,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 86 percent of all benefits. An average of 4,000 infants -- 31 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 46,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 7,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$118 million over seven years from Alaska's nutrition benefits for children, a 26 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$53 million, a 9 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 24,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$47 million over seven years, a 12 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$36 million, a 9 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$71 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$17 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Alaska.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$29 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 48 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 17,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

ARIZONA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Arizona protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 268,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 84 percent of all benefits. An average of 32,000 infants -- 49 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 376,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 36,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$704 million over seven years from Arizona's nutrition benefits for children, a 21 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$386 million, a 9 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 268,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$488 million over seven years, a 16 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$311 million, a 10 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$216 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$75 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Arizona.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$271 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 62 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 199,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

ARKANSAS: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Arkansas protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 141,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 84 percent of all benefits. An average of 23,000 infants -- 68 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 311,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 18,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$330 million over seven years from Arkansas' nutrition benefits for children, an 16 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$205 million, an 8 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 141,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$217 million over seven years, a 13 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$158 million, a 10 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$113 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$47 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Arkansas.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$89 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 39 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 68,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

CALIFORNIA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in California protects the nutritional well-being of millions of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 1.9 million children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 90 percent of all benefits. An average of 265,000 infants -- 46 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 2.3 million children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 243,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$5.5 billion over seven years from California's nutrition benefits for children, a 25 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$2.8 billion, a 11 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 1.9 million children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$3.7 billion over seven years, a 20 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$2.2 billion, a 12 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$1.8 billion over seven years; the Senate would cut \$590 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in California.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$1.8 billion short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 70 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 1.6 million fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

COLORADO: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Colorado protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 148,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 84 percent of all benefits. An average of 14,000 infants -- 26 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 295,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 41,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$412 million over seven years from Colorado's nutrition benefits for children, a 21 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$282 million, an 11 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 148,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$269 million over seven years, a 15 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$195 million, an 11 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$143 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$87 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Colorado.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$103 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 44 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 74,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

CONNECTICUT: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Connecticut protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 117,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 83 percent of all benefits. An average of 14,000 infants -- 32 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 226,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 20,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$251 million over seven years from Connecticut's nutrition benefits for children, a 16 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$205 million, an 11 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 117,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$203 million over seven years, an 18 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$167 million, a 14 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$48 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$38 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Connecticut.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$109 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 65 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 85,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

DELAWARE: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Delaware protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 31,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 84 percent of all benefits. An average of 4,000 infants -- 42 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 64,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 11,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$86 million over seven years from Delaware's nutrition benefits for children, a 17 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$61 million, an 11 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 31,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$53 million over seven years, a 14 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$38 million, a 10 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$33 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$23 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Delaware.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$32 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 61 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 23,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in the District of Columbia protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 48,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 78 percent of all benefits. An average of 6,000 infants -- 61 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 47,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 5,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$120 million over seven years from the District of Columbia's nutrition benefits for children, a 21 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$64 million, an 8 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 48,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$84 million over seven years, a 14 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$59 million, a 10 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$36 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$5 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in the District of Columbia.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$54 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 58 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 32,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

FLORIDA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Florida protects the nutritional well-being of over a million children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 789,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 80 percent of all benefits. An average of 83,000 infants -- 43 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 1.2 million children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 63,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$2.3 billion over seven years from Florida's nutrition benefits for children, a 21 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$1.2 billion, a 9 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 789,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$1.7 billion over seven years, a 17 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$1.1 billion, an 11 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$599 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$108 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Florida.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$966 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 69 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 568,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

GEORGIA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Georgia protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 417,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 83 percent of all benefits. An average of 56,000 infants -- 52 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 959,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 46,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$849 million over seven years from Georgia's nutrition benefits for children, a 15 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$566 million, an 8 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 417,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$676 million over seven years, a 13 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$478 million, an 9 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$173 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$88 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Georgia.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$434 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 58 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 279,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

HAWAII: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Hawaii protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 50,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 73 percent of all benefits. An average of 7,000 infants -- 36 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 139,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 26,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$187 million over seven years from Hawaii's nutrition benefits for children, a 19 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$93 million, a 7 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 50,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$127 million over seven years, a 14 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$81 million, an 9 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$60 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$12 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Hawaii.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$73 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 45 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 29,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

IDAHO: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Idaho protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 42,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 87 percent of all benefits. An average of 8,000 infants -- 46 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 142,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 7,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$92 million over seven years from Idaho's nutrition benefits for children, a 13 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$70 million, a 9 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 42,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$73 million over seven years, a 16 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$52 million, an 11 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$19 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$18 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Idaho.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$20 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 33 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 20,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

ILLINOIS: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Illinois protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 612,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 81 percent of all benefits. An average of 72,000 infants -- 38 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 940,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 68,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$1.6 billion over seven years from Illinois' nutrition benefits for children, a 19 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$1.1 billion, a 10 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 612,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$1.3 billion over seven years, a 16 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$928 million, a 12 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$271 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$167 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Illinois.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$342 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 31 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 231,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

INDIANA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Indiana protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 257,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 86 percent of all benefits. An average of 37,000 infants -- 45 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 597,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 40,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$529 million over seven years from Indiana's nutrition benefits for children, a 14 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$405 million, a 9 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 257,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$452 million over seven years, a 14 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$336 million, a 10 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$77 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$69 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Indiana.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$223 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 51 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 168,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

IOWA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Iowa protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 97,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 83 percent of all benefits. An average of 12,000 infants -- 34 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 382,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 26,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$201 million over seven years from Iowa's nutrition benefits for children, a 13 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$176 million, a 10 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 97,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$165 million over seven years, a 15 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$128 million, an 11 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$36 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$48 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Iowa.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$38 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 25 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 35,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

KANSAS: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Kansas protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 93,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 83 percent of all benefits. An average of 14,000 infants -- 41 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 308,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 58,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$365 million over seven years from Kansas' nutrition benefits for children, a 22 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$280 million, a 15 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 93,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$197 million over seven years, a 18 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$154 million, a 14 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$168 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$126 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Kansas.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$71 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 47 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 53,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

KENTUCKY: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Kentucky protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 241,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 82 percent of all benefits. An average of 29,000 infants -- 55 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 506,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 34,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$545 million over seven years from Kentucky's nutrition benefits for children, a 16 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$345 million, an 8 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 241,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$430 million over seven years, a 13 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$313 million, a 10 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$115 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$32 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Kentucky.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$111 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 25 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 86,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

LOUISIANA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Louisiana protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 410,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 86 percent of all benefits. An average of 38,000 infants -- 55 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 671,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 56,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$1.1 billion over seven years from Louisiana's nutrition benefits for children, a 20 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$619 million, a 9 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 410,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$686 million over seven years, a 13 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$478 million, a 9 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$365 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$141 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Louisiana.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$196 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 29 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 142,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

MAINE: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Maine protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 61,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 73 percent of all benefits. An average of 6,000 infants -- 44 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 105,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 13,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$168 million over seven years from Maine's nutrition benefits for children, a 21 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$125 million, a 12 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 61,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$107 million over seven years, a 14 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$88 million, a 12 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$61 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$37 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Maine.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$60 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 52 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 36,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

MARYLAND EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Maryland protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 198,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 82 percent of all benefits. An average of 24,000 infants -- 34 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 361,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 32,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$627 million over seven years from Maryland's nutrition benefits for children, a 21 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$432 million, a 12 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 198,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$445 million over seven years, a 17 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$337 million, a 13 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$182 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$95 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Maryland.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$187 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 50 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 119,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

MASSACHUSETTS EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Massachusetts protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 229,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 83 percent of all benefits. An average of 27,000 infants -- 33 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 452,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 47,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$636 million over seven years from Massachusetts' nutrition benefits for children, a 20 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$442 million, a 12 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 229,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$472 million over seven years, a 19 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$339 million, a 13 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$164 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$103 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Massachusetts.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$189 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 53 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 120,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

MICHIGAN: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Michigan protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 513,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 78 percent of all benefits. An average of 53,000 infants -- 38 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 744,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 66,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$1.1 billion over seven years from Michigan's nutrition benefits for children, an 18 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$842 million, an 11 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 513,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$900 million over seven years, a 15 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$671 million, an 11 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$220 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$171 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Michigan.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$351 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 39 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 246,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

MINNESOTA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Minnesota protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 172,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 82 percent of all benefits. An average of 20,000 infants -- 32 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 518,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 94,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$542 million over seven years from Minnesota's nutrition benefits for children, a 19 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$478 million, a 16 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 172,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$301 million over seven years, a 16 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$233 million, a 13 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$241 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$245 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Minnesota.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$124 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 48 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 88,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

MISSISSIPPI: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Mississippi protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 273,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 85 percent of all benefits. An average of 30,000 infants -- 70 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 408,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 31,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$642 million over seven years from Mississippi's nutrition benefits for children, a 19 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$352 million, an 8 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 273,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$434 million over seven years, a 13 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$304 million, a 9 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$208 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$48 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Mississippi.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$97 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 23 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 84,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

MISSOURI: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Missouri protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 291,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 82 percent of all benefits. An average of 32,000 infants -- 43 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 555,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 40,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$678 million over seven years from Missouri's nutrition benefits for children, an 18 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$466 million, a 10 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 291,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$515 million over seven years, a 14 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$374 million, a 10 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$163 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$92 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Missouri.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$254 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 50 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 169,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

MONTANA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Montana protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 34,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 82 percent of all benefits. An average of 4,000 infants -- 38 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 87,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 12,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$109 million over seven years from Montana's nutrition benefits for children, a 20 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$71 million, an 11 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 34,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$60 million over seven years, a 14 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$45 million, an 11 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$49 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$26 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Montana.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$22 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 36 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 15,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

NEBRASKA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Nebraska protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 61,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 85 percent of all benefits. An average of 8,000 infants -- 36 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 204,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 38,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$202 million over seven years from Nebraska's nutrition benefits for children, a 21 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$148 million, a 13 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 61,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$91 million over seven years, a 14 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$70 million, an 11 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$111 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$78 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Nebraska.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$30 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 35 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 27,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

NEVADA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Nevada protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 55,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 81 percent of all benefits. An average of 7,000 infants -- 33 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 93,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 4,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$137 million over seven years from Nevada's nutrition benefits for children, an 18 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$78 million, a 9 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 55,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$98 million over seven years, a 15 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$66 million, a 10 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$39 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$12 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Nevada.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$65 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 69 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 40,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in New Hampshire protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 29,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 81 percent of all benefits. An average of 5,000 infants -- 31 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 88,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 6,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$67 million over seven years from New Hampshire's nutrition benefits for children, a 14 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$56 million, a 9 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 29,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$55 million over seven years, a 16 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$47 million, a 14 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$12 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$9 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in New Hampshire.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$36 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 75 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 26,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

NEW JERSEY: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in New Jersey protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 268,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 81 percent of all benefits. An average of 35,000 infants -- 30 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 511,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 35,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$718 million over seven years from New Jersey's nutrition benefits for children, a 17 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$511 million, a 10 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 268,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$627 million over seven years, a 17 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$465 million, a 13 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$91 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$46 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in New Jersey.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$278 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 52 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 157,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

NEW MEXICO: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in New Mexico protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 132,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 88 percent of all benefits. An average of 13,000 infants -- 46 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 184,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 43,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$457 million over seven years from New Mexico's nutrition benefits for children, a 25 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$269 million, a 12 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 132,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$258 million over seven years, a 16 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$173 million, an 11 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$199 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$96 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in New Mexico.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$102 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 49 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 76,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

NEW YORK: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in New York protects the nutritional well-being of over a million children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 965,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 72 percent of all benefits. An average of 116,000 infants -- 42 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 1.6 million children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 144,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$3.4 billion over seven years from New York's nutrition benefits for children, a 23 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$2.3 billion, a 13 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 965,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$2.9 billion over seven years, a 23 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$2.1 billion, a 17 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$552 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$197 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in New York.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$1.0 billion short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 50 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 459,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

NORTH CAROLINA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in North Carolina protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 324,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 85 percent of all benefits. An average of 49,000 infants -- 49 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 751,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 52,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$754 million over seven years from North Carolina's nutrition benefits for children, a 16 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$446 million, an 8 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 324,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$503 million over seven years, a 13 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$373 million, a 10 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$251 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$73 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in North Carolina.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$283 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 54 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 195,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

NORTH DAKOTA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in North Dakota protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 24,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 83 percent of all benefits. An average of 4,000 infants -- 44 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 89,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 19,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$92 million over seven years from North Dakota's nutrition benefits for children, a 22 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$77 million, a 15 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 24,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$39 million over seven years, a 14 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$34 million, a 12 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$53 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$43 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in North Dakota.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$15 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 41 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 11,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

OHIO: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Ohio protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 611,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 78 percent of all benefits. An average of 74,000 infants -- 46 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 976,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 76,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$1.4 billion over seven years from Ohio's nutrition benefits for children, an 18 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$1.0 billion, a 10 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 611,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$1.2 billion over seven years, a 15 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$895 million, an 11 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$231 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$127 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Ohio.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$383 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 33 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 259,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

OKLAHOMA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Oklahoma protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 180,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 84 percent of all benefits. An average of 24,000 infants -- 53 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 367,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 40,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$485 million over seven years from Oklahoma's nutrition benefits for children, a 19 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$276 million, an 8 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 180,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$320 million over seven years, a 14 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$226 million, a 10 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$165 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$50 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Oklahoma.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$143 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 44 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 102,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

OREGON: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Oregon protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 137,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 78 percent of all benefits. An average of 15,000 infants -- 36 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 246,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 32,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$526 million over seven years from Oregon's nutrition benefits for children, a 24 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$392 million, a 15 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 137,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$388 million over seven years, a 22 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$308 million, an 18 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$138 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$84 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Oregon.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$106 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 41 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 71,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

PENNSYLVANIA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Pennsylvania protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 556,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 74 percent of all benefits. An average of 58,000 infants -- 37 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 975,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 72,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$1.1 billion over seven years from Pennsylvania's nutrition benefits for children, a 16 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$845 million, a 9 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 556,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$984 million over seven years, a 14 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$740 million, an 11 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$133 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$105 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Pennsylvania.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$487 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 45 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 319,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

RHODE ISLAND: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Rhode Island protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 49,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 84 percent of all benefits. An average of 5,000 infants -- 41 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 58,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 7,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$156 million over seven years from Rhode Island's nutrition benefits for children, a 24 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$113 million, a 14 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 49,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$135 million over seven years, a 23 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$106 million, an 18 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$21 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$7 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Rhode Island.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$45 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 56 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 30,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

SOUTH CAROLINA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in South Carolina protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 214,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 88 percent of all benefits. An average of 32,000 infants -- 63 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 451,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 20,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$463 million over seven years from South Carolina's nutrition benefits for children, a 15 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$284 million, an 8 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 214,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$324 million over seven years, a 13 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$234 million, a 9 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$139 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$50 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in South Carolina.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$139 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 43 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 112,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

SOUTH DAKOTA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in South Dakota protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 32,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 88 percent of all benefits. An average of 5,000 infants -- 49 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 106,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 12,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$77 million over seven years from South Dakota's nutrition benefits for children, a 15 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$63 million, an 11 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 32,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$48 million over seven years, a 13 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$38 million, an 11 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$29 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$25 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in South Dakota.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$11 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 25 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 9,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

TENNESSEE: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Tennessee protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 364,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 79 percent of all benefits. An average of 51,000 infants -- 68 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 594,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 33,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$784 million over seven years from Tennessee's nutrition benefits for children, an 18 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$494 million, a 9 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 364,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$619 million over seven years, a 14 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$435 million, a 10 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$165 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$59 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Tennessee.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$312 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 50 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 201,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

TEXAS: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Texas protects the nutritional well-being of millions of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 1,422,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 85 percent of all benefits. An average of 156,000 infants -- 48 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 2,138,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 147,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$4.2 billion over seven years from Texas's nutrition benefits for children, a 22 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$2.3 billion, a 10 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 1,422,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$3.1 billion over seven years, an 18 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$2.0 billion, an 11 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$1.1 billion over seven years; the Senate would cut \$357 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Texas.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$1.4 billion short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 57 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 936,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

UTAH: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Utah protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 79,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 86 percent of all benefits. An average of 14,000 infants -- 36 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 246,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 38,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$254 million over seven years from Utah's nutrition benefits for children, a 20 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$173 million, a 12 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 74,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$122 million over seven years, a 15 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$86 million, an 11 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$132 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$87 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Utah.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$42 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 41 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 37,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

VERMONT: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Vermont protects the nutritional well-being of tens of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 25,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 77 percent of all benefits. An average of 3,000 infants -- 42 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 49,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 8,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$61 million over seven years from Vermont's nutrition benefits for children, a 17 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$49 million, a 12 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 25,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$42 million over seven years, a 15 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$34 million, a 12 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$19 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$15 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Vermont.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$29 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 60 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 20,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

VIRGINIA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Virginia protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 261,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 81 percent of all benefits. An average of 32,000 infants -- 33 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 590,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 36,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$579 million over seven years from Virginia's nutrition benefits for children, a 15 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$430 million, a 10 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 261,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$492 million over seven years, a 15 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$352 million, a 10 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$87 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$78 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Virginia.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$272 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 56 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 174,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

WASHINGTON: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Washington protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 230,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 81 percent of all benefits. An average of 31,000 infants -- 40 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 418,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 46,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$867 million over seven years from Washington's nutrition benefits for children, a 25 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$596 million, a 14 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 230,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$635 million over seven years, a 22 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$475 million, a 17 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$232 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$121 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Washington.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$226 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 54 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 127,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

WISCONSIN: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in Wisconsin protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 181,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 86 percent of all benefits. An average of 24,000 infants -- 35 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 486,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 47,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$286 million over seven years from Wisconsin's nutrition benefits for children, a 10 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$300 million, a 10 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 181,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$288 million over seven years, a 15 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$230 million, a 12 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would increase Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$2 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$70 million. The Senate cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in Wisconsin.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$80 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 32 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 74,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.

WEST VIRGINIA: EFFECTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PROPOSALS ON CHILDREN

The nutrition safety net in West Virginia protects the nutritional well-being of hundreds of thousands of children.

- o Since the nationwide expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC, nutritional status -- measured by growth, birthweight, and anemia -- has improved.
- o About 208,000 children receive food stamps each month; families with children account for 95 percent of all benefits. An average of 12,000 infants -- 58 percent of all infants born in the State -- participate in the WIC Program monthly.
- o Each school day, 195,000 children receive USDA-supported lunches. Another 10,000 children participate daily in the child and adult care feeding program.

The House would cut \$367 million over seven years from West Virginia's nutrition benefits for children, a 19 percent reduction by 2002; the Senate would cut \$244 million, a 9 percent reduction by 2002.

- o Every child now receiving food stamps would have less under the Congressional proposals; 208,000 children would face reduced food stamp benefits.
- o The House bill would cut food stamp benefits to families with children by \$292 million over seven years, a 13 percent reduction; the Senate would cut \$221 million, a 10 percent reduction.
- o The House bill would cut Child Nutrition and WIC Program benefits by \$75 million over seven years; the Senate would cut \$23 million. All of these cuts would fall on families with children.

The optional food stamp block grant proposed in both bills could jeopardize the nutrition and health of many children in West Virginia.

- o Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, funding for food stamp benefits would have fallen \$97 million short of actual need by 1994, a reduction of 36 percent. *The Program would have been able to serve 75,000 fewer children.*

The School-Based and Family Nutrition Block Grants proposed by the House eliminate a critical part of the nutrition safety net and jeopardize 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.

- o National nutrition standards work. Under a block grant, there could be 50 different standards and no incentive to provide children with nutritious meals.
- o If these programs had been converted to block grants in 1990, the School-Based grant would have resulted in nearly 17 percent less funding for meals to schoolchildren in 1994 nationwide; the Family Nutrition grant would have resulted in 43 percent less funding.